



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

1651  
S

**RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR  
RESTRICTION AND REQUEST FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME**

Docket Number:  
85940/15

APR 17 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

Application Number  
08/928,893

Filing Date  
September 12, 1997

Examiner  
D. Naff

Art Unit  
1651

Invention Title  
**PROCESS FOR THE SIMULTANEOUS  
PRODUCTION OF XYLITOL AND ETHANOL**

Inventor(s)  
Heikkila et al.

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being  
deposited with the United States Postal Service as first  
class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for  
Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on:

Date: 4-10-02

Donna M. Praiss  
Donna M. Praiss (Reg. No. 34,232)

**RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR RESTRICTION**

SIR:

Applicants hereby **request a one-month extension of time** for responding to the Requirement for Restriction mailed February 13, 2002, for which a one-month response period was set. The extended period expires on April 13, 2002. The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) extension fee of \$110, or any additional required fees, to the deposit account of **Kenyon & Kenyon**, deposit account number **11-0600**.

In the Requirement for Restriction mailed February 13, 2002, Applicants were required to elect one of the following groups of claims:

Group I: claims 1, 3, 5-13, 15-16, 19-21 and 23-31, relating to a process for the simultaneous production of xylitol and ethanol from a starting material of hydrolyzed lignocellulose-containing material; and

Group II: claims 32-34, relating to a process for the simultaneous production of xylitol and ethanol from a starting material of sulphite spent liquor.

In response, Applicants elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I, claims 1, 3, 5-13, 15-16, 19-21 and 23-31.

This election is made with traverse because even though the claims of Groups I and II may be considered by the Examiner as patentably distinct from one another, it is believed that the claims are sufficiently related to be properly presented in a single application. Given the commonality of the subject matter here, examination of all the claims should not place a serious burden upon the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

*Donna M. Praiss*

Dated: 4-10-02

Donna M. Praiss  
Reg. No. 34,232

One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200